



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,136	03/24/2004	Yutaka Tanaka	740819-1053	2750
78198 7590 07/25/2008 Studebaker & Brackett PC 1890 Preston White Drive Suite 105 Reston, VA 20191				
EXAMINER				
ABOAGYE, MICHAEL				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1793				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/25/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/807,136

Applicant(s)

TANAKA ET AL.

Examiner

MICHAEL ABOAGYE

Art Unit

1793

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 March 2008 and 19 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06/19/2008
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

AFFIDAVIT

1. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Dracup et al. reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897). A complete English translation of the evidence with dates is required to enable the examiner conduct full and complete evaluation of said evidence and to establish the conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Dracup et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 3, 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA (applicant's admitted prior art) in view of Dracup et al. (US Patent No. 6,986,452).

AAPA shows a method for fabricating a frame by providing an elongated and curved shaped outer frame member of T-shaped section having an extension extending

inwardly; the outer frame member being formed to have an elongate shape and being curved (102, figure 9A), said extension having a top surface, a bottom surface and an inner curved edge, having an inner frame member having a flat portion (the web 106 has a flat portion, figures 9(A&B)) connected to the extension of the outer frame member, the inner frame member being formed to have an elongate shape and being curved in accordance with the shape of the longitudinal direction of the outer frame member, said flat portion having, an upper surface (107, figures 9 (A&B)), a lower surface and an outer curved edge surface and joining the outer frame member and the inner frame member by riveting/fastening; wherein the line of joint connecting the inner and the outer members forms a curve shape (Applicant's specification, page 1, line 17- page 2, line 8, figures (9A&B)). AAPA also has an inner L-shaped section (AAPA, figures (9(A&B)). AAPA also teaches subjecting the outer and the inner frame members to surface treatment or finish coating and assembling the components (see, AAPA figure 10).

AAPA does not expressly teach abutting the inner curved surfaces of the outer frame and the inner frame and joining them together by friction stir welding to form a weld seam along the abutted surfaces.

However Dracup et al. teaches a method of joining an aircraft structural parts by using friction stir instead of riveting in view of the fact that friction stir welding is a more viable and cost reducing alternative to riveting (Dracup et al., abstract, column 1, line 65-column 2, line 14 and figures 5-9). Dracup et al. in figures 25-30 show friction stir welding two or more elongated plates (51, 52, 52) with surface abutted against each other without overlapping surfaces (see, Dracup et al., column 11, lines 38-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to weld the components of AAPA by using friction stir welding as taught Dracup et al. since friction stir welding is a more viable and cost reducing alternative to riveting also the overall weight of the structure can comparatively be reduced (Dracup et al., column 1, lines 14-23 and lines 57-67).

6. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA (applicant's admitted prior art) in view of Dracup et al. (US Patent No. 6,986,452) as applied to claim 3 above and further in view of Litwinski et al. (US Patent No. 6,780,525).

AAPA and Dracup et al. combined teaches subjecting the outer and the inner frame members to surface treatment or finish coating prior but not after friction stir welding the members.

Litwinski et al. teaches subjecting friction stir welded structural member/s to post weld treatment process including, solution heat treatment, precipitate hardening, annealing and surface peening to control post weld degradation of the material properties of the members (Litwinski et al., column 2, lines 21-26 and lines 40-60; figures 5A, 6A, 7, and 8). Litwinski et al. also teaches friction stir welding two components in surface abutment relationship with each other without overlapping surfaces (Litwinski et al., figures 5A, 6A). Litwinski et al. also teaches pre or post machining of the members to a predetermined shape (Litwinski et al., column 5, line 66-column 6, line 16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to conduct post weld treatment of the members in the combined inventions of AAPA and Dracup et al. in order to minimize degradation of the material properties of the members after welding (Litwinski et al., column 2, lines 21-26 and lines 40-60).

7. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA (applicant's admitted prior art) in view of Dracup et al. (US Patent No. 6,986,452) as applied to claim 3 above and further in view of Myer (US Patent No. 4,278,863).

AAPA and Dracup et al. do not expressly teach forming a cutaways or holes in the frame.

Myer teaches welding components to form a large structure, forming a plurality of holes or cutouts (44A figures 3 and 4) in the individual components with the purpose of reducing the overall weight of the components after assembled (Myers, abstract, column 5, lines 43-50 and figures 3 and 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to provide a plurality of holes or cutouts (44A figures 3 and 4) in the frames used in the combined invention of AAPA and Dracup et al. as taught by Myers to reduce the overall weight of the components after assembled (Myers, abstract, column 5, lines 43-50).

Response to Arguments

8. The examiner acknowledges the applicants' amendment received by USPTO on March 06, 2008. Claim 3-9 remain under consideration in the application.

9. Applicant's arguments filed March 06, 2008 and June 19, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the subject matter of Dracup et al. is disqualified as prior art, at least, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.131, MPEP § 715.07(a), and MPEP § 2138.06 for examination procedure. The subject matter of Dracup et al., upon which the Examiner relies, i.e., column 11, lines 38-44, was newly added subject matter included only in the continuation-in-part of the Dracup et al. reference. Thus, the priority date of this information discussed in Dracup et al. is entitled to the May 15, 2003 date. As evidenced, inter alia, by Applicants' attached copy of the research planning document and Declaration under 37 CFR § 1.131, the subject matter, to which the present application is fully entitled, predates the Dracup et al. reference. Hence, the information of Dracup et al., relied upon by the Examiner, is not available as prior art. It is noted and as indicted above the evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Dracup et al. reference. Applicant also argued that the column 11, lines 38-44 or Dracup et al. relied upon in the grounds of rejection was newly added subject matter included only in the continuation-in-part of the Dracup et al. The examiner agrees, however the applicant fail to cite other portions of the Patent to Dracup et al. used in the grounds of rejection which were rather more pertinent to the claimed invention. In particular the abstract and column 1, line 65-column 2, lines 14, which teach the idea

and the basis of substituting friction stir welding for riveting were not mention in the applicant's argument. It is noted that the patent to Dracup et al. was used in the rejection for the most part to remedy the deficiencies of AAPA to use friction stir welding instead of riveting. By modifying the invention of AAPA by the teachings of Dracup et al. gains such as minimizing degradation of the material properties of the members after welding can be achieved. Applicant in his remarks asserted that the remaining references, either to Litwinski et al. or Myer, also do not cure the deficiencies of AAPA in that they fail to disclose the recited elements of the claims found lacking by AAPA. It is noted that no substantive issues have been raise against the merits of these references (i.e. Litwinski et al. or Myer) in the grounds of rejection; hence the rejections of claims 3-9 shall remain.

Conclusion

10. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL ABOAGYE whose telephone number is (571)272-8165. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:30am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Aboagye/
Assistant Examiner,
Art Unit 1793

/Kevin P. Kerns/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793